

BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP  
Mark C. Mao (CA Bar No. 236165)  
mmao@bsfllp.com  
44 Montgomery Street, 41st Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
Telephone: (415) 293 6858  
Facsimile: (415) 999 9695

SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.  
William Christopher Carmody (pro hac vice)  
bcarmody@susmangodfrey.com  
Shawn J. Rabin (pro hac vice)  
srabin@susmangodfrey.com  
1301 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor  
New York, NY 10019  
Telephone: (212) 336-8330

MORGAN & MORGAN  
John A. Yanchunis (pro hac vice)  
jyanchunis@forthepeople.com  
Ryan J. McGee (pro hac vice)  
rmcgee@forthepeople.com  
201 N. Franklin Street, 7th Floor  
Tampa, FL 33602  
Telephone: (813) 223-5505

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs; additional counsel  
listed in signature blocks below*

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &  
SULLIVAN, LLP  
Andrew H. Schapiro (pro hac vice)  
andrewschapiro@quinnemanuel.com  
191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2700  
Chicago, IL 60606  
Telephone: (312) 705-7400  
Facsimile: (312) 705-7401

Stephen A. Broome (CA Bar No. 314605)  
stephenbroome@quinnemanuel.com  
Viola Trebicka (CA Bar No. 269526)  
violatrebicka@quinnemanuel.com  
865 S. Figueroa Street, 10th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90017  
Telephone: (213) 443-3000  
Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

Jomaire A. Crawford (admitted pro hac vice)  
jomairecrawford@quinnemanuel.com  
51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor  
New York, NY 10010  
Telephone: (212) 849-7000  
Facsimile: (212) 849-7100

*Attorneys for Defendant; additional counsel  
listed in signature blocks below*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, OAKLAND DIVISION

CHASOM BROWN, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

GOOGLE LLC,

Defendant.

Case No. 4:20-cv-03664-YGR-SVK

**JOINT SUBMISSION RE: SEALING  
PORTIONS OF JULY 15, 2022 ORDER  
CLARIFYING PRESERVATION PLAN  
(DKT. 630)**

Referral: Hon. Susan van Keulen, USMJ

1 July 22, 2022

2 Submitted via ECF

3 Magistrate Judge Susan van Keulen  
4 San Jose Courthouse  
5 Courtroom 6 - 4th Floor  
6 280 South 1st Street  
7 San Jose, CA 95113

6 Re: Joint Submission Re: Sealing Portions of the July 15, 2022 Order Clarifying  
7 Preservation Plan (Dkt. 630)  
8 *Brown v. Google LLC*, Case No. 4:20-cv-03664-YGR-SVK (N.D. Cal.)

8 Dear Magistrate Judge van Keulen:

9 Pursuant to Your Honor's July 15, 2022 Order regarding sealing the clarification of the  
10 preservation plan, Plaintiffs and Google LLC ("Google") jointly submit this statement.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Google respectfully seeks to seal the following portions of the July 15, 2022 Order regarding sealing the clarification of the preservation plan (“Order”), which contain Google’s confidential and proprietary information regarding highly sensitive features of Google’s internal systems and operations that Google does not share publicly, including internal data security measures, various types of Google’s internal projects, data signals, and logs, and their proprietary functionalities, as well as internal metrics, that Google maintains as confidential in the ordinary course of its business and is not generally known to the public or Google’s competitors. This information is highly confidential and should be protected.

This Administrative Motion pertains to the following information contained in the Order:

Document	Portions to be Filed Under Seal	Party Claiming Confidentiality
July 15, 2022 Sealed Order Clarifying Preservation Plan	Portions highlighted in blue at:  Page 2:7	Google
Exhibit 1 - List of Logs Identified in Proceedings before SM	In its entirety	Google

The parties conferred on the proposed redactions to the Order. Plaintiffs take no position and do not oppose sealing the proposed redactions.

#### **I. LEGAL STANDARD**

The common law right of public access to judicial records in a civil case is not a constitutional right and it is “not absolute.” *Nixon v. Warner Communications, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 598 (1978) (noting that the “right to inspect and copy judicial records is not absolute” and that

1 “courts have refused to permit their files to serve as reservoirs of . . . sources of business information  
 2 that might harm a litigant’s competitive standing”). Sealing is appropriate when the information at  
 3 issue constitutes “competitively sensitive information,” such as “confidential research,  
 4 development, or commercial information.” *France Telecom S.A. v. Marvell Semiconductor Inc.*,  
 5 2014 WL 4965995, at \*4 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 3, 2014); *see also Phillips v. Gen. Motors Corp.*, 307 F.3d  
 6 1206, 1211 (9th Cir. 2002) (acknowledging courts’ “broad latitude” to “prevent disclosure of  
 7 materials for many types of information, including, but not limited to, trade secrets or other  
 8 confidential research, development, or commercial information”).

9 **II. THE ABOVE IDENTIFIED MATERIALS EASILY MEET THE “GOOD CAUSE”**  
 10 **STANDARD AND SHOULD ALL BE SEALED**

11 Courts have repeatedly found it appropriate to seal documents that contain “business  
 12 information that might harm a litigant’s competitive standing.” *Nixon*, 435 U.S. at 589-99. Good  
 13 cause to seal is shown when a party seeks to seal materials that “contain[ ] confidential information  
 14 about the operation of [the party’s] products and that public disclosure could harm [the party] by  
 15 disclosing confidential technical information.” *Digital Reg. of Texas, LLC v. Adobe Sys., Inc.*, 2014  
 16 WL 6986068, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 10, 2014). Materials that could harm a litigant’s competitive  
 17 standing may be sealed even under the “compelling reasons” standard. *See e.g., Icon-IP Pty Ltd. v.*  
 18 *Specialized Bicycle Components, Inc.*, 2015 WL 984121, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 4, 2015)  
 19 (information “is appropriately sealable under the ‘compelling reasons’ standard where that  
 20 information could be used to the company’s competitive disadvantage”) (citation omitted).

21 Here, the Order comprises confidential information regarding highly sensitive features of  
 22 Google’s internal systems and operations that Google does not share publicly. Specifically, this  
 23 information provides details related to internal data security measures, various types of Google’s  
 24 internal projects, data signals, and logs, and their proprietary functionalities, as well as internal  
 25 metrics. Such information reveals Google’s internal strategies, system designs, and business  
 26 practices for operating and maintaining many of its important services while complying with legal  
 27 and privacy obligations.  
 28

Public disclosure of the above-listed information would harm Google’s competitive standing it has earned through years of innovation and careful deliberation, by revealing sensitive aspects of Google’s proprietary systems, strategies, designs, and practices to Google’s competitors. That alone is a proper basis to seal such information. *See, e.g., Free Range Content, Inc. v. Google Inc.*, No. 14-cv-02329-BLF, Dkt. No. 192, at 3-9 (N.D. Cal. May 3, 2017) (granting Google’s motion to seal certain sensitive business information related to Google’s processes and policies to ensure the integrity and security of a different advertising system); *Huawei Techs., Co. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.*, No. 3:16-cv-02787-WHO, Dkt. No. 446, at 19 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 30, 2019) (sealing confidential sales data because “disclosure would harm their competitive standing by giving competitors insight they do not have”); *Trotsky v. Travelers Indem. Co.*, 2013 WL 12116153, at \*8 (W.D. Wash. May 8, 2013) (granting motion to seal as to “internal research results that disclose statistical coding that is not publically available”).

Moreover, if publicly disclosed, malicious actors may use such information to seek to compromise Google’s internal systems and data structures. Google would be placed at an increased risk of cyber security threats, and data related to its users could similarly be at risk. *See, e.g., In re Google Inc. Gmail Litig.*, 2013 WL 5366963, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 25, 2013) (sealing “material concern[ing] how users’ interactions with the Gmail system affects how messages are transmitted” because if made public, it “could lead to a breach in the security of the Gmail system”). The security threat is an additional reason for this Court to seal the identified information. The information Google seeks to redact, internal projects, identifiers, and cookies, and their proprietary functionalities, is the minimal amount of information needed to protect its internal systems and operations from being exposed to not only its competitors but also to nefarious actors who may improperly seek access to and disrupt these systems and operations. The “good cause” rather than the “compelling reasons” standard should apply but under either standard, Google’s sealing request is warranted.

### III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Google respectfully requests that the Court seal the identified portions of the Order.

Respectfully,

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &  
SULLIVAN, LLP

/s/ Andrew H. Schapiro

Andrew H. Schapiro (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
andrewschapiro@quinnemanuel.com  
191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2700  
Chicago, IL 60606  
Tel: (312) 705-7400  
Fax: (312) 705-7401

Diane M. Doolittle (CA Bar No. 142046)  
dianedoolittle@quinnemanuel.com  
Sara Jenkins (CA Bar No. 230097)  
sarajenkins@quinnemanuel.com  
555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor  
Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
Telephone: (650) 801-5000  
Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

Stephen A. Broome (CA Bar No. 314605)  
stephenbroome@quinnemanuel.com  
Viola Trebicka (CA Bar No. 269526)  
violatrebicka@quinnemanuel.com  
Crystal Nix-Hines (Bar No. 326971)  
crystalnixhines@quinnemanuel.com  
Alyssa G. Olson (CA Bar No. 305705)  
alyolson@quinnemanuel.com  
Marie Hayrapetian (CA Bar No. 315797)  
mariehayrapetian@quinnemanuel.com  
865 S. Figueroa Street, 10th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90017  
Telephone: (213) 443-3000  
Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

Jomaire A. Crawford (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
jomairecrawford@quinnemanuel.com  
51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor  
New York, NY 10010  
Telephone: (212) 849-7000  
Facsimile: (212) 849-7100

Josef Ansorge (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
josefansorge@quinnemanuel.com  
Xi ("Tracy") Gao (CA Bar No. 326266)  
tracygao@quinnemanuel.com  
Carl Spilly (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
carlspilly@quinnemanuel.com  
1300 I Street NW, Suite 900  
Washington D.C., 20005  
Telephone: (202) 538-8000  
Facsimile: (202) 538-8100

BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP

/s/ Mark C. Mao

Mark C. Mao (CA Bar No. 236165)  
mmao@bsfllp.com  
Sean Phillips Rodriguez (CA Bar No. 262437)  
srodriguez@bsfllp.com  
Beko Reblitz-Richardson (CA Bar No. 238027)  
brichardson@bsfllp.com  
44 Montgomery Street, 41<sup>st</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
Tel: (415) 293 6858  
Fax: (415) 999 9695

James W. Lee (*pro hac vice*)  
jlee@bsfllp.com  
Rossana Baeza (*pro hac vice*)  
rbaeza@bsfllp.com  
100 SE 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, Suite 2800  
Miami, FL 33130  
Tel: (305) 539-8400  
Fax: (305) 539-1304

William Christopher Carmody (*pro hac vice*)  
bcarmody@susmangodfrey.com  
Shawn J. Rabin (*pro hac vice*)  
srabin@susmangodfrey.com  
Steven Shepard (*pro hac vice*)  
sshepard@susmangodfrey.com  
Alexander P. Frawley (*pro hac vice*)  
afrawley@susmangodfrey.com  
SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.  
1301 Avenue of the Americas, 32<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10019  
Tel: (212) 336-8330

Amanda Bonn (CA Bar No. 270891)  
abonn@susmangodfrey.com  
SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.  
1900 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400  
Los Angeles, CA 90067  
Tel: (310) 789-3100

John A. Yanchunis (*pro hac vice*)  
jyanchunis@forthepeople.com  
Ryan J. McGee (*pro hac vice*)  
rmcgee@forthepeople.com  
MORGAN & MORGAN, P.A.  
201 N Franklin Street, 7th Floor  
Tampa, FL 33602

Jonathan Tse (CA Bar No. 305468)  
jonathantse@quinnemanuel.com  
50 California Street, 22nd Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Telephone: (415) 875-6600  
Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

*Attorneys for Defendant*

Tel: (813) 223-5505  
Fax: (813) 222-4736  
Michael F. Ram (CA Bar No. 104805)  
mram@forthepeople.com  
MORGAN & MORGAN, P.A.  
711 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 500  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Tel: (415) 358-6913  
*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

**ATTESTATION OF CONCURRENCE**

I am the ECF user whose ID and password are being used to file this Joint Submission.  
Pursuant to Civil L.R. 5-1(i)(3), I hereby attest that each of the signatories identified above has  
concurred in the filing of this document.

Dated: July 22, 2022

By /s/ Andrew H. Schapiro  
Andrew H. Schapiro  
*Counsel on behalf of Google LLC*